UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/886,748	06/21/2001	Shoichi Matsuo	JP920000121US1	5920

25259 7590 05/03/2006

IBM CORPORATION
3039 CORNWALLIS RD.
DEPT. T81 / B503, PO BOX 12195
REASEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709

EXAMINER	
GUILL, RUSSELL L	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2123	

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/886,748	MATSUO, SHOICHI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Russell L. Guill	2123	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,8,17,19,22 and 23* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,8,17,19,22-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *21 June 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to an Amendment filed March 6, 2006. A summary of the current status of the claims is: Claims 7, 9 - 16, 18 and 20 - 21 have been cancelled. Claims 1 - 6, 8, 17, 19 and 22 - 23 are pending. Claims 1 - 6, 8, 17, 19 and 22 - 23 have been examined. Claims 1 - 6, 8, 17, 19 and 22 - 23 have been rejected.

2. **The Examiner would like to thank the Applicant for the well-presented response, which was useful is the examination process.**

Response to Remarks

3. Regarding **claims 1, 5, 17, 19, 22 and 23** that were objected to:

   3.1. Applicant's amendments overcome the objections.

4. Regarding **claims 22 and 23** rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph:

   4.1. Applicant's amendments overcome the rejections.

5. Regarding **claim 23** rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101:

   5.1. Applicant's amendments overcome the rejections.

6. Regarding **claim 5** rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

   6.1. Applicant's amendment overcomes the rejection, however, upon further search, a new rejection has been issued, necessitated by amendment. The Examiner appreciates the Applicant's amendment, however it appears that prior art exists for the additional limitation.

7. Regarding **claim 1** rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

7.1. Applicant's amendment overcomes the rejection, however, upon further search, a new rejection has been issued, necessitated by amendment.

8. Regarding **claims 17, 19, and 22 - 23** rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

8.1. Applicant's amendments overcome the rejections, however, upon further search, new rejections have been issued, necessitated by amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. **Claim 1** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen (U.S. Patent 6,772,204) in view of Eidahl (Eidahl, Loren D.; "Platinum Edition Using Visual Basic 6", 1999, Que Corporation), further in view of Robbins (Robbins, Judd; "Mastering DOS", Second edition, 1988, Sybex).

10.1. Hansen teaches in response to a specification of a component provided by a system configuration editor, generating said component in a drawing screen of said system configuration editor (*figure 4; and column 11, lines 63 - 67; and column 12, lines 1 - 7*).

10.2. Hansen teaches associating a plurality of components by responding to an operation that generates a connecting line that associates a component with any other component (*figure 4; and column 12, lines 26 - 45*).

10.3. Hansen teaches recording attribute data that is input as a property of said component (*figure 5; and column 14, lines 34 - 50*).

10.4. Hansen teaches automatically generating a configuration file of a system from attribute data and a configuration file template (*figure 1B, elements 12, 14, 18, 20, and 22; and column 5, lines 9 - 67; and column 6, lines 1 - 25*).

10.5. Hansen teaches that in the step of automatically generating the configuration file, replacing a shadow property included in the configuration file template with a property specific to the system included in the attribute data (*column 3, lines 37 - 58, especially lines 50 - 58; and column 14, lines 34 - 50*).

10.6. Hansen does not specifically teach associating a plurality of components by one of the steps of*: including a component in any other component, superposing said component on any other component*, and responding to an operation that generates a connecting line that associates a component and any other component.

10.7. Hansen does not specifically teach replacing a shadow property included in said configuration file template, *said shadow property being identified by an input property token*, with a specific to said system included in said attribute data.

10.8. Eidahl teaches associating a plurality of components by including a component in any other component (*page 383, section "Working with Controls in a Frame"; a control component was associated with other components by including the components in a frame component*).

10.9. Eidahl teaches associating a plurality of components by superposing a component on any other component (*page 383, section "Working with Controls in a Frame"; a control component was associated with other components by superposing the components on a frame component*).

10.10. Robbins appears to teach a shadow property being identified by an input property token (*pages 369 - 370, refer to DOS variables %1, %2, etc.; the DOS variables %1 and %2 are input propert tokens that represent shadow properties such as a directory name or file extension type*).

10.11. The motivation to use the art of Robbins with the art of Hansen would have been the benefit recited in Robbins that a batch file can multiply the power of DOS dramatically (*page 361, first paragraph*). The ordinary artisan would have recognized batch files as macro script files, and appreciated the value of their use of input property tokens.

10.12. The motivation to combine the art of Eidahl with the art of Hansen would have been the knowledge of the ordinary artisan that the features recited in Eidahl (i.e., that a container control component can hold other control components within its borders, and the contained components are treated as part of the container component (*page 168, first paragraph*)), would provide faster development of a system by eliminating explicit program code to make a component part of another component.

10.13. Therefore, as discussed above, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of invention to use the art of Eidahl and the art of Robbins with the art of Hansen to produce the claimed invention.

11. **Claims 2 and 3** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen in view of Eidahl, further in view of Robbins as applied to **claim 1** above, further in view of Contreras (U.S. Patent Number 6,823,299).

11.1. Hansen as modified by Eidahl and Robbins teach the method for constructing a system using a system configuration editor as recited in **claim 1** above.

11.2. **Regarding claim 2:**

11.3. Hansen teaches inputting default data to a part of attribute data of a component (*column 7, lines 24 - 27*).

11.4. Hansen does not specifically teach inputting default data to a part of attribute data a component, *wherein said default data includes an influence area of said component and a reference point of said component*.

11.5. Contreras teaches default data includes an influence area of a component and a reference point of a component (*column 7, lines 1 - 5; and column 8, lines 41 - 45*).

11.5.1. Regarding (*column 7, lines 1 - 5; and column 8, lines 41 - 45*); it would have been obvious to have default data that includes an influence area of a component and a reference point of a component.

11.6. The motivation to use the art of Contreras with the art of Hansen as modified by Eidahl and Robbins is the benefit recited in Contreras that the invention could be used to automatically position objects to help create designs (*column 7, lines 26 - 28*).

11.7. Therefore, as discussed above, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of invention to use the art of Contreras with the art of Hansen as modified by Eidahl and Robbins to produce the claimed invention.

11.8. **Regarding claim 3:**

11.9. Hansen does not specifically teach if all or part of component is included within an influence area of any other component, then a part of attribute data of said component inherits the attribute data of said other component.

11.10. Eidahl teaches if all or part of component is included within an influence area of any other component, then a part of attribute data of said component inherits the attribute data of said other component (***page 64, the paragraph that starts with, "In addition, setting the form's . . . "***).

12. **Claim 4** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen in view of Eidahl, further in view of Robbins as applied to **claim 1** above, further in view of Chiles (U.S. Patent 6,167,567).

12.1. Hansen as modified by Eidahl and Robbins teach the method for constructing a system using a system configuration editor as recited in **claim 1** above.

12.2. Hansen does not specifically teach referring to information about a product version used in the system, and selecting a configuration file template that matches the product version.

12.3. Chiles teaches referring to information about a product version used in the system, and selecting a configuration file template that matches the product version (***column 2, lines 41 – 56***).

12.4. The motivation to use the art of Chiles with the art of Hansen as modified by Eidahl and Robbins is the benefit recited in Chiles of correctly updating software (***column 3, lines 20 – 21***).

12.5. Therefore, as discussed above, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of invention to use the art of Chiles with the art of Hansen as modified by Eidahl and Robbins to produce the claimed invention.

13. **Claim 5** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen (U.S. Patent 6,772,204) in view of Robbins (Robbins, Judd; "Mastering DOS", Second edition, 1988, Sybex).

13.1. Hansen teaches means for providing components of a system (*figure 4; and column 11, lines 63 - 67; and column 12, lines 1 - 7*).

13.2. Hansen teaches means for displaying said components and relations between said components and editing an arrangement of said components (*figure 4; and column 10, lines 14 - 22*).

13.3. Hansen teaches means for generating or inputting and displaying properties of said components (*figure 4; and figure 5; and figure 6; and column 7, lines 24 - 28; and column 2, lines 28 - 65*).

13.4. Hansen teaches means for receiving said properties that are generated or input as attribute data of said components and automatically generating a configuration file of the system (*column 3, lines 50 - 58*).

13.5. Hansen teaches that in the means for automatically generating the configuration file, replacing a shadow property included in the configuration file template with a property specific to the system included in the attribute data (*column 3, lines 37 - 58, especially lines 50 - 58; and column 14, lines 34 - 50*).

13.6. Hansen does not specifically teach replacing a shadow property included in said configuration file template, *said shadow property being identified by an input property token*, with a specific to said system included in said attribute data.

13.7. Robbins appears to teach a shadow property being identified by an input property token (*pages 369 - 370, refer to DOS variables %1, %2, etc.; the DOS variables %1 and %2 are input propert tokens that represent shadow properties such as a directory name or file extension type*).

13.8. The motivation to use the art of Robbins with the art of Hansen would have been the benefit recited in Robbins that a batch file can multiply the power of DOS dramatically (*page 361, first paragraph*). The ordinary artisan would have recognized batch files as macro script files, and appreciated the value of their use of input property tokens.

13.9. Therefore, as discussed above, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of invention to use the art of Robbins with the art of Hansen to produce the claimed invention.

14. **Claim 6** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen in view of Robbins as applied to **claim 5** above, further in view of Eidahl (Eidahl, Loren D.; "Platinum Edition Using Visual Basic 6", 1999, Que Corporation), further in view of Contreras (U.S. Patent Number 6,823,299).

14.1. Hansen as modified by Robbins teaches the method for constructing a system as recited in **claim 5** above.

14.2. Hansen teaches means for generating default data as a part of attribute data of a component (*column 7, lines 24 - 27*).

14.3. Hansen teaches means for associating a plurality of components by generating a connecting line that associates a component with any other component (*figure 4; and column 12, lines 26 - 45*).

14.4. Hansen does not specifically teach means for generating default data as a part of attribute data a component, *wherein said default data includes an influence area of said component and a reference point of said component*.

14.5. Hansen does not specifically teach means for associating a plurality of components *by one of the steps of: including said component in any other component, superposing said component on any other component*, and by generating a connecting line that associates said component with any other

component, *wherein if said component is included within an influence area of any other component, then attribute data of said component inherits attribute data of said other component*.

14.6. Eidahl teaches means for associating a plurality of components by including a component in any other component (*page 383, section "Working with Controls in a Frame"; a control component was associated with other components by including the components in a frame component*).

14.7. Eidahl teaches means for associating a plurality of components by superposing a component on any other component (*page 383, section "Working with Controls in a Frame"; a control component was associated with other components by superposing the components on a frame component*).

14.8. Eidahl teaches if a component is included within an influence area of any other component, then attribute data of the component inherits attribute data of the other component (*page 64, the paragraph that starts with, "In addition, setting the form's . . . "*).

14.9. Contreras teaches that default data includes an influence area of a component and a reference point of a component (*column 7, lines 1 - 5; and column 8, lines 41 - 45*).

14.9.1. Regarding (*column 7, lines 1 - 5; and column 8, lines 41 - 45*); it would have been obvious to have default data that includes an influence area of a component and a reference point of a component.

14.10. The motivation to use the art of Contreras with the art of Hansen as modified by Robbins is the benefit recited in Contreras that the invention could be used to automatically position objects to help create designs (*column 7, lines 26 - 28*).

14.11. The motivation to combine the art of Eidahl with the art of Hansen and Robbins is the benefit recited in Eidahl that a container control component can hold other control components within its borders, and the contained components are treated as part of the container component (*page 168, first*

paragraph). Therefore, as discussed above, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of invention to use the art of Eidahl and Contreras with the art of Hansen and Robbins to produce the claimed invention.

15. **Claim 8** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen in view of Robbins as applied to **claim 5** above, further in view of Chiles (U.S. Patent 6,167,567).

15.1. Hansen as modified by Robbins teaches the method for constructing a system as recited in **claim 5** above.

15.2. Hansen does not specifically teach means for referring to information about a product version used in the system, and selecting a configuration file template that matches the product version.

15.3. Chiles teaches referring to information about a product version used in the system, and selecting a configuration file template that matches the product version (*column 2, lines 41 - 56*).

15.4. The motivation to use the art of Chiles with the art of Hansen as modified by Robbins is the benefit recited in Chiles of correctly updating software (*column 3, lines 20 - 27*).

15.5. Therefore, as discussed above, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of invention to use the art of Chiles with the art of Hansen as modified by Robbins to produce the claimed invention.

16. **Claims 17, 19 and 22 - 23** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen (U.S. Patent 6,772,204), in view of Robbins (Robbins, Judd; "Mastering DOS", Second edition, 1988, Sybex), further in view of Chiles (U.S. Patent 6,167,567).

16.1. Regarding claims 17, 19 and 22:

16.2. Hansen teaches computer implemented methods (**Abstract**), functions (**Abstract; and column 18, 38 - 40**) and means (**Abstract**).

16.2.1. Regarding (**Abstract**) and (**Abstract; and column 18, 38 - 40**); it would have been obvious that computer implemented methods and program code are functions and means.

16.3. Hansen teaches receiving attribute data of components that comprise the system (*figure 5; and column 14, lines 34 - 50*).

16.4. Hansen teaches expanding the configuration file template with macro expansion (*figure 2E; and figure 1B, elements 12, 18, 20, and 14; and column 8, lines 37 - 44; and column 3, lines 37 - 58, especially lines 50 - 58; and column 14, lines 34 - 50*).

16.5. Hansen teaches that in the step of expanding the configuration file template, replacing a shadow property included in the configuration file template with a property specific to the system included in the attribute data (*column 3, lines 37 - 58, especially lines 50 - 58; and column 14, lines 34 - 50*).

16.6. Hansen does not specifically teach referring to information about a product version used in the system, and selecting a configuration file template that matches the product version.

16.7. Hansen does not specifically teach replacing a shadow property included in said configuration file template, *said shadow property being identified by an input property token*, with a specific to said system included in said attribute data.

16.8. Chiles teaches referring to information about a product version used in the system, and selecting a configuration file template that matches the product version (*column 2, lines 41 - 56*).

16.9. Robbins appears to teach a shadow property being identified by an input property token (*pages 369 - 370, refer to DOS variables %1, %2, etc.; the DOS variables %1 and %2 are input propert tokens that represent shadow properties such as a directory name or file extension type*).

16.10. The motivation to use the art of Robbins with the art of Hansen would have been the benefit recited in Robbins that a batch file can multiply the power of DOS dramatically (*page 361, first paragraph*). The ordinary artisan would have recognized batch files as macro script files, and appreciated the value of their use of input property tokens.

16.11. The motivation to use the art of Chiles with the art of Hansen is the benefit recited in Chiles of correctly updating software (*column 3, lines 20 - 25*).

16.12. Therefore, as discussed above, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of invention to use the art of Chiles and Robbins with the art of Hansen to produce the claimed inventions.

==========

16.13. Regarding **claim 23**:

16.14. Hansen teaches computer readable media (**column 18, lines 38 - 40**), computer implemented methods (**Abstract**), functions (**Abstract; and column 18, lines 38 - 40**) and means (**Abstract**).

16.14.1. Regarding (**Abstract**) and (**Abstract; and column 18, lines 38 - 40**); it would have been obvious that computer implemented methods and program code are functions and means.

16.15. Hansen teaches most of the limitations of the claim as described in claim 22 above, and the differences are reviewed below.

16.16. Hansen teaches a function for, in response to a input of properties of a component, recording the input values as property data of the component (*column 3, lines 37 - 57; and figure 5; and column 14, lines 34 - 50*).

16.17. Hansen does not specifically teach a function for referring to information about a product version used in the system.

16.18. Hansen does not specifically teach a function for selecting a configuration file template that matches the product version.

16.19. Chiles teaches a function for referring to information about a product version used in the system (*column 2, lines 41 - 56*).

16.20. Chiles teaches a function for selecting a configuration file template that matches the product version (*column 2, lines 41 - 56*).

Conclusion

17. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the

mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Russ Guill whose telephone number is 571-272-7955. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 10:00 AM - 6:30 PM.

19. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Rodriguez can be reached on 571-272-3753. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC2100 Group Receptionist: 571-272-2100.

20. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Russ Guill
Examiner
~~Art Unit 2123~~

RG

Paul L. Rodriguez 4/27/06
Supervisory Primary Examiner
Art Unit ~~2125~~ 2123